arXiv:1609.06044v1 [math.NA] 20 Sep 2016

Stabilized nonconforming finite element methods for data assimilation in incompressible flows

Erik Burman* and Peter Hansbo †

Abstract

We consider a stabilized nonconforming finite element method for data assimilation in incompressible flow subject to the Stokes' equations. The method uses a primal dual structure that allows for the inclusion of nonstandard data. Error estimates are obtained that are optimal compared to the conditional stability of the ill-posed data assimilation problem.

1 Introduction

The design of computational methods for the numerical approximation of the Stokes' system of equations modelling creeping incompressible flow is by and large well understood in the case where the underlying problem is well-posed. Indeed, provided suitable boundary conditions are set, the system of equations are known to satisfy the hypotheses of the Lax-Milgram lemma and Brezzi's theorem ensuring well-posedness of velocities and pressure. These theoretical results then underpin much of the theory for the design of stable and accurate finite element methods for the Stokes system [14, 4].

In many cases of interest in applications, however, the necessary data for the theoretical results to hold are not known; this is the case for instance in data assimilation in atmospheric sciences or oceanography. Instead of knowing the solution on the boundary, data in the form of measured values of velocities may be known in some other set. It is then not obvious how best to apply the theory developed for the well-posed case. A classical approach is to rewrite the system as an optimisation problem and add some regularization, making the problem well-posed on the continuous level and then approximate the well-posed problem using known techniques. For examples of methods using this framework see [1] and [6].

In this paper we advocate a different approach in the spirit of [8, 9]. The idea is to formulate the optimization problem on the continuous level, but without any regularization. We then discretize the ill-posed continuous problem and instead regularize the discrete solution. This leads to a method in the spirit of stabilized finite element methods where the properties of the different stabilizing operators are well studied. An important feature of this approach is that it eliminates the need for a perturbation analysis on the continuous level taking into account the Tikhonov regularization and perturbations in data, that the discretization error then has to match. In our case we are only interested in the discretization error and the perturbations in data. This allows us to derive error estimates that are optimal in the case of unperturbed data in a similar fashion as for the well-posed case.

We exemplify the theory in a model case for data assimilation where data is given in some subset of the computational domain instead of the boundary, and we obtain error estimates using a conditional stability result in the form of a three ball inequality due to Lin, Uhlmann, and Wang [19]. A particular feature of the method formulated for the integration of data in the bulk (and not on the boundary), is that the dual adjoint problem does not require any regularization on

*Department of Mathematics, University College London, London, UK-WC1E 6BT, United Kingdom, e.burman@ucl.ac.uk

†Department of Mechanical Engineering, Jönköping University, SE-55111 Jönköping, Sweden, peter.hansbo@ju.se

the discrete level. Indeed, the adjoint equation is inf–sup stable, similarly to the case of elliptic problems on non-divergence form discussed in [21].

The rest of the paper can be outlined as follows. First, in Section 2, we introduce the Stokes' problem that we are interested in and propose the continuous minimization problem. Then, in Section 3, we present the non-conforming finite element method and prove some preliminary results. In Section 4 we prove the fundamental stability and convergence results of the formulation. Finally we show the performance of the approach on some numerical examples.

2 Stokes equations

Let Ω be a polygonal (polyhedral) domain in $\mathbb{R}^d$, $d = 2$ or 3. We are interested in computing solutions to the Stokes' system

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta u + \nabla p &= \mathfrak{f} \quad \text{in } \Omega \\ \nabla \cdot u &= \mathfrak{g} \quad \text{in } \Omega. \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

Typically these equations are then equipped with suitable boundary conditions and are known to be well-posed using the Lax-Milgram Lemma for the velocities and Brezzi's theorem for the pressures. It is also known that the following continuous dependence estimate holds, here given under the assumption of homogeneous Dirichlet conditions on the boundary.

$$\|u\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + \|p\|_\Omega \lesssim \|\mathfrak{f}\|_{H^{-1}(\Omega)} + \|\mathfrak{g}\|_\Omega, \tag{2.2}$$

where we used the notation $\|x\|_\Omega := \|x\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$ and $a \lesssim b$ for $a \leq Cb$ with $C > 0$.

Observe that for any solution to the equations (2.1) and in any closed ball $B_R \subset \Omega$ there holds

$$(u, p)|_{B_R} \in [H^2(B_R)]^d \times H^1(B_R). \tag{2.3}$$

Provided $\mathfrak{f} \in [L^2(\Omega)]^d$ and $\mathfrak{g} \in H^1(\Omega)$. See for instance [20, Proposition 3.2].

We will in the following make the stronger assumption that $(u, p) \in [H^2(\Omega)]^d \times H^1(\Omega)$. Observe that this is not a strong assumption for the particular problem we will study below, since the domain Ω here is somewhat arbitrary and not necessarily determined by a physical geometry. Indeed the only situation in which this assumption can fail is when the boundary of Ω coincides with a physical boundary with a corner.

Herein the main focus will be on methods that allow for the accurate approximation of the solution under the much weaker stability estimates that remain valid in the case of ill-posed problems where (2.2) fails.

A situation of particular interest is the case where the boundary data g_D is known only on a portion Γ_D of $\partial\Omega$ and nothing is known of the boundary conditions on the remaining part $\Gamma_D' := \partial\Omega \setminus \Gamma_D$. This lack of boundary information makes the problem ill-posed and we assume that some other data is known such as:

- The normal stress in some part of the boundary $\Gamma_N \subset \partial\Omega$ and $\Gamma_N \cap \Gamma_D \neq \emptyset$,

  $$(-n \cdot \nabla u + pn) \cdot n = \psi. \tag{2.4}$$

  We will refer to this problem as the *Cauchy problem* below.

- The measured value of (u, p) in some subdomain $\omega \subset \Omega$. We will refer to this problem as the *data assimilation problem* below.

In the first case it is known that if a solution exists, then $g_D = \psi = 0$ implies $u = 0$, $p = 0$ in Ω by unique continuation [13], however, no quantitiative estimates appear to exist in the literature for the pure Cauchy problem; see [5] for results using additional measurements on the boundary. In the second case stability may be proven in the form of a three balls inequality and associated

local stability estimates, see [19, 5]. For completeness of the analysis we focus on the second case for the error estimates below. In particular we consider the case where no data are known on the boundary, i.e. $\Gamma_D = \Gamma_N = \emptyset$. In the data assimilation case the following Theorem from [19] provides us with a conditional stability estimate. Assuming an optimal conditional stability estimate for the Cauchy problem in the spirit of [3], it is straightforward to extend the anaysis to this case following [7].

Theorem 2.1. *(Conditional stability for the Stokes' problem) There exists a positive number $\tilde{R} < 1$ such that if $0 < R_1 < R_2 < R_3 \leq R_0$ and $R_1/R_3 < R_2/R_3 < \tilde{R}$, then if $B_{R_0}(x_0) \subset \Omega$*

$$\int_{B_{R_2}(x_0)} |u|^2 \ dx \leq C \left(\int_{B_{R_1}(x_0)} |u|^2 \ dx \right)^{\tau} \left(\int_{B_{R_3}(x_0)} |u|^2 \ dx \right)^{1-\tau}$$

for $(u, p) \in [H^1(B_{R_0}(x_0))]^{d+1}$, satisfying (2.1) with $\mathfrak{f} = \mathfrak{g} = 0$ in $B_{R_0}(x_0)$, where the constant C depends on R_2/R_3 and $0 < \tau < 1$ depends on R_1/R_3, R_2/R_3 and d. For fixed R_2 and R_3, the exponent τ behaves like $1/(-\log(R_1))$ when R_1 is sufficiently small.

Proof. For the proof we refer to [19]. □

In the data assimilation problem corresponding to Theorem 2.1 measured data $u_M : \omega \mapsto \mathbb{R}^d$ are available in ω such that u_M satisfies (2.1) in ω and there exists u defined on Ω satisfying (2.1) such that $u|_\omega = u_M$. Our objective is to design a method for the reconstruction of u, given $\tilde{u}_M := u_M + \delta u$, where $\delta u \in [L^2(\omega)]^d$ is a perturbation of the exact data resulting from measurement error or interpolation of pointwise measurements inside ω. Observe that the considered configuration is also closely related to a pure boundary control problem, where we look for data on the boundary such that $u = u_M$ in the subset ω.

We will first cast the problem (2.1), with the notation $\mathfrak{f} = f$ and with $\mathfrak{g} = 0$, on weak form. For the derivation of the weak formulation we introduce the spaces $V := \{v \in [H^1(\Omega)]^d\}$ and $W := \{v \in [H_0^1(\Omega)]^d\}$ for velocities and $Q := L^2(\Omega)$ and $Q_0 := L_0^2(\Omega)$, where the zero–subscript in the second case as usual indicates that the functions have zero integral over Ω.

We may the multiply the first equation of (2.1) by $w \in W$ and first integrate over Ω and then apply Green's formula to obtain

$$\int_\Omega \nabla u : \nabla w \ \mathrm{d}x - \int_\Omega p \nabla \cdot w \ \mathrm{d}x = \int_\Omega f w \ \mathrm{d}x, \quad \forall w \in W$$

similarly we may multiply the second equation by $q \in L^2(\Omega)$ and integrate over Ω to get

$$\int_\Omega q \nabla \cdot u \ \mathrm{d}x = 0.$$

Introducing the forms

$$a(u, w) := \int_\Omega \nabla u : \nabla w \ \mathrm{d}x,$$

$$b(p, w) = -\int_\Omega p \, \nabla \cdot w \ \mathrm{d}x$$

and

$$l(w) := \int_\Omega f w \ \mathrm{d}x$$

we may formally write the problem as: find $(u, p) \in V \times Q_0$ such that $u|_\omega = u_M$ and

$$a(u, w) + b(p, w) = l(w), \quad \forall w \in W \tag{2.5}$$

$$b(y, u) = 0, \quad \forall y \in Q. \tag{2.6}$$

Observe that this problem is ill-posed. In particular observe that we are not allowed to test with $w = u$ because of the homogeneous Dirichlet conditions set on the functions in W. To regularize the problem we cast it on the form of a minimization problem, first writing

$$A[(u,p),(w,y)] := a(u,w) + b(p,w) - b(y,u)$$

and then introducing the Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L}[(u,p),(z,x)] := \frac{1}{2}m(u-\tilde{u}_M, u-\tilde{u}_M) + A[(u,p),(z,x)] - l(z),$$

where $m(\cdot,\cdot)$ is a bilinear form that depends on what data we wish to integrate. For the data assimilation problem that is our main concern we simply have

$$m(u,v) := \gamma_M \int_\omega uv \ \mathrm{d}x,$$

where $\gamma_M > 0$ is a free parameter. We will also use the notation

$$(u,v)_\omega := \int_\omega uv \ \mathrm{d}x.$$

The optimality system of the associated constrained minimization problem takes the form

$$A[(u,p),(w,y)] = l(w) \tag{2.7}$$

$$A[(v,q),(z,x)] + m(u,v) = m(\tilde{u}_M, v). \tag{2.8}$$

This problem is ill-posed in general, but in the data assimilation case we know that if a solution exists and $l(w) = 0$ then this solution must satisfy the conditional stability of Theorem 2.1. A consequence of this is that if the system admits a solution $(u,p) \in V \times L^2(\Omega)$ for the exact data u_M, then this solution is unique. To show this assume that there are two solutions $u_1 \in V$ and $u_2 \in V$ that solve (2.7)–(2.8), then $v = u_1 - u_2 \in V$ solves the homogenous Stokes' equation and has $v|_\omega = 0$ and the uniqueness is a consequence of unique continuation based on Theorem 2.1. Below we will assume that there exists a unique solution $(u,p) \in [H^2(\Omega)]^d \times H^1(\Omega)$ that satisfies (2.1) in Ω with $u = u_M$ in ω.

3 The nonconforming stabilized method

Let $\{\mathcal{T}_h\}_h$ denote a family of shape regular and quasi uniform tesselations of Ω into nonoverlapping simplices, such that for any two different simplices $\kappa, \kappa' \in \mathcal{T}_h$, $\kappa \cap \kappa'$ consists of either the empty set, a common face or a common vertex. The outward pointing normal of a simplex κ will be denoted n_κ. We denote the set of element faces in $\mathcal{T}_h$ by $\mathcal{F}$ and let $\mathcal{F}_i$ denote the set of interior faces F in $\mathcal{F}$. To each face F we associate a unit normal vector, n_F. For interior faces its orientation is arbitrary, but fixed. On the boundary $\partial\Omega$ we identify n_F with the outward pointing normal of Ω. We define the jump over interior faces $F \in \mathcal{F}_i$ by $[v]|_F := \lim_{\epsilon\to 0^+}(v(x|_F - \epsilon n_F) - v(x|_F + \epsilon n_F))$ and for faces on the boundary, $F \in \partial\Omega$, we let $[v]|_F := v|_F$. Similarly we define the average of a function over an interior face F by $\{v\}|_F := \frac{1}{2}\lim_{\epsilon\to 0^+}(v(x|_F - \epsilon n_F) + v(x|_F + \epsilon n_F))$ and for F on the boundary we define $\{v\}|_F := v|_F$. The classical nonconforming space of piecewise affine finite element functions (see [11]) then reads

$$X_h := \{v_h \in L^2(\Omega) : \int_F [v_h] \ \mathrm{d}s = 0, \ \forall F \in \mathcal{F}_i \text{ and } v_h|_\kappa \in \mathbb{P}_1(\kappa), \ \forall \kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h\}$$

where $\mathbb{P}_1(\kappa)$ denotes the set of polynomials of degree less than or equal to one restricted to the element κ, and with homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions

$$X_h^0 := \{v_h \in L^2(\Omega) : \int_F [v_h] \ \mathrm{d}s = 0, \ \forall F \in \mathcal{F} \text{ and } v_h|_\kappa \in \mathbb{P}_1(\kappa), \ \forall \kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h\}.$$

We may then define the spaces $V_h := [X_h]^d$ and $W_h := [X_h^0]^d$. For the pressure spaces we define

$$Q_h := \{q_h \in L^2(\Omega) : q|_\kappa \in \mathbb{R}, \forall \kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h\} \text{ and } Q_h^0 := Q_h \cap L_0^2(\Omega).$$

To make the notation more compact we introduce the composite spaces $\mathcal{V}_h := V_h \times Q_h^0$ and $\mathcal{W}_h := W_h \times Q_h$.

3.1 Finite element formulation

By writing the equations (2.7)–(2.8) with arguments in the discrete spaces, the formulation may now naively be written: find $(u_h, p_h) \times (z_h, x_h) \in \mathcal{V}_h \times \mathcal{W}_h$ such that,

$$A_h[(u_h, p_h), (w_h, y_h)] = l(w) \tag{3.1}$$

$$A_h[(v_h, q_h), (z_h, x_h)] + m(u_h, v_h) = m(\tilde{u}_M, v_h). \tag{3.2}$$

for all $(v_h, q_h) \times (w_h, y_h) \in \mathcal{V}_h \times \mathcal{W}_h$. The discrete bilinear form is defined by

$$A_h[(u_h, p_h), (w_h, y_h)] := a_h(u_h, w_h) + b_h(p_h, w_h) - b_h(y_h, u_h) \tag{3.3}$$

where the forms are defined by

$$a_h(u_h, w_h) = \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_\kappa \nabla u_h : \nabla w_h \, \mathrm{d}x,$$

$$b_h(p_h, w_h) = -\sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_\kappa p_h \, \nabla \cdot w_h \, \mathrm{d}x.$$

To obtain a stable formulation we need to add stabilizing terms. This can be done in several different ways, resulting in different methods with different stability, accuracy and conservation properties. Our choice herein has been guided by the principle that stabilization is added only if it is necessary for accuracy and has minimal influence on the conservation properties of the scheme. We will also comment on some variants. For the primal velocities we suggest to use the standard jump stabilization that has been shown to stabilize the Crouzeix-Raviart element in a number of applications [15, 16, 10],

$$s_{j,t}(u_h, v_h) := \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}_i} \int_F h_F^t [u_h][v_h] \, \mathrm{d}s. \tag{3.4}$$

For the pressure on the other hand we propose to use the following weak penalty term

$$s_{p,t}(p_h, q_h) := \int_\Omega h^t p_h q_h \, \mathrm{d}x. \tag{3.5}$$

We also propose the compact form: find $(U_h, Z_h) \in \mathcal{V}_h \times \mathcal{W}_h$, where $U_h := (u_h, p_h) \in V_h \times Q_h^0$ and $Z_h := (z_h, x_h) \in W_h \times Q_h$, such that,

$$\mathcal{A}_h[(U_h, Z_h), (X_h, Y_h)] + \mathcal{S}_h[(U_h, Z_h), (X_h, Y_h)] + m(u_h, v_h) = l(w_h) + m(\tilde{u}, v_h) \tag{3.6}$$

for all $(X_h, Y_h) \in \mathcal{V}_h \times \mathcal{W}_h$, $X_h := (v_h, q_h)$ and $Y_h := (w_h, y_h)$. The bilinear forms are then given by

$$\mathcal{A}_h[(U_h, Z_h), (X_h, Y_h)] := A_h[(u_h, p_h), (w_h, y_h)] + A_h[(v_h, q_h), (z_h, x_h)] \tag{3.7}$$

and

$$\mathcal{S}_h[(U_h, Z_h), (X_h, Y_h)] := S_p[(u_h, p_h), (v_h, q_h)] - S_a[(z_h, x_h), (w_h, y_h)], \tag{3.8}$$

where S_a and S_p are positive semi-definite, symmetric bilinear forms. In the following, we shall also make use of the following bilinear form

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}[(U_h, Z_h), (X_h, Y_h)] :=& \mathcal{A}_h[(U_h, Z_h), (X_h, Y_h)] \\ &+ \mathcal{S}_h[(U_h, Z_h), (X_h, Y_h)] + m(u_h, v_h). \end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

The precise design of the regularization is problem dependent. For the Cauchy problem, the velocities must be stabilized both for the forward and the adjoint problems. This is not necessary in the data assimilation case, where the stabilizing terms takes the form

$$S_p[(u_h, p_h), (v_h, q_h)] := \gamma_u s_{j,-1}(u_h, v_h) + \gamma_p s_{p,2}(p_h, q_h),\ \gamma_u > 0,\ \gamma_p \geq 0 \tag{3.10}$$

and

$$S_a[(z_h, x_h), (w_h, y_h)] := \gamma_x s_{p,0}(x_h, y_h),\ \gamma_x \geq 0. \tag{3.11}$$

Observe that the minimal stabilization that allows for optimal error estimates is $\gamma_u > 0$, $\gamma_p = \gamma_x = 0$. In the analysis below we will focus on this case, noting that the case with added pressure stabilization follows in a similar way, but is slightly more elementary. From the theoretical point of view the choice $\gamma_p > 0$ has no detrimental effect, neither on conservation nor on the accuracy of the primal solution. The choice $\gamma_x > 0$ on the other hand perturbs both local and global conservation, but still allows for optimal error estimates. The interest of the addition of the pressure stabilization stems from the possibility of eliminating the pressure and we briefly discuss the resulting formulation before proceeding with the analysis.

3.2 Elimination of the pressure

Consider the dual mass conservation equation in the formulation (3.6) with the stabilization given by (3.10) and (3.11) and $\gamma_p > 0$,

$$b(q_h, z_h) + s_{p,2}(p_h, q_h) = 0, \forall q_h \in Q_h^0.$$

Observing that $\gamma_p^{-1} h^{-2} \nabla \cdot w_h \in Q_h^0$ we may eliminate the physical pressure from the formulation, since

$$\begin{aligned} b(p_h, w_h) = -(p_h, \nabla \cdot w_h)_h = -s_{p,2}(p_h, \gamma_p^{-1} h^{-2} \nabla \cdot w_h) = b(\gamma_p^{-1} h^{-2} \nabla \cdot w_h, z_h) \\ = (\gamma_p^{-1} h^{-2} \nabla \cdot w_h, \nabla \cdot z_h)_h. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for $\gamma_x > 0$ the dual pressure x_h may be eliminated. Starting from the mass conservation equation

$$-b(y_h, u_h) - s_{x,0}(x_h, y_h) = 0$$

we use that $y_h = \nabla \cdot v_h$ is a valid test function to deduce

$$-b(x_h, v_h) = -(x_h, \nabla \cdot v_h)_h = s_{x,0}(x_h, \nabla \cdot v_h) = -b(\nabla \cdot v_h, u_h) = (\nabla \cdot v_h, \nabla \cdot u_h)_h.$$

The resulting formulation is an equal order interpolation formulation for the Stokes' system using the nonconforming Crouzeix-Raviart element for both the forward and the dual system. Find $(u_h, z_h) \in V_h \times W_h$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} a_h(u_h, w_h) - (\gamma_p^{-1} h^{-2} \nabla \cdot w_h, \nabla \cdot z_h)_h &= l(w_h) \\ a_h(z_h, v_h) + (\nabla \cdot u_h, \nabla \cdot v_h)_h + s_{j,-1}(u_h, v_h) + m(u_h, v_h) &= m(\tilde{u}_M, v_h) \end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

for all $(v_h, w_h) \in V_h \times W_h$. We identify this scheme as a discretization of the continuous regularization of the Stokes' Cauchy problem proposed in [6]. It follows that the analysis below also covers that method in the special case that the discretization uses the nonconforming space X_h.

3.3 Technical Lemmas

We will end this section by proving some elementary Lemmas that will be useful in the analysis below. We will use $\|\cdot\|_X$ to denote the L^2–norm over X, subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$ or $\mathbb{R}^{d-1}$.

We recall the interpolation operator $r_h : [H^1(\Omega)]^d \to [X_h]^d$ defined by the (component wise) relation

$$\overline{\{r_h v\}}|_F := |F|^{-1} \int_F \{r_h v\}\ \mathrm{d}s = |F|^{-1} \int_F v\ \mathrm{d}s$$

for every $F \in \mathcal{F}$ and with $|F|$ denoting the $(d-1)$-measure of F. It is conventient to introduce the broken scalar product

$$(x, y)_h := \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_\kappa xy \, \mathrm{d}x,$$

with the associated norms

$$\|x\|_h^2 := (x, x)_h \text{ and } \|x\|_{1,h}^2 := \|x\|_h^2 + a_h(x, x).$$

The following inverse and trace inequalities are well known

$$\begin{aligned} \|v\|_{\partial\kappa} \leq C_t(h^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|v\|_\kappa + h^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\nabla v\|_\kappa), \quad \forall v \in H^1(\kappa), \\ h_\kappa \|\nabla v_h\|_\kappa + h_\kappa^{\frac{1}{2}}\|v_h\|_{\partial\kappa} \leq C_i \|v_h\|_\kappa, \quad \forall v_h \in X_h. \end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

Using the inequalities of (3.13) and standard approximation results from [11] it is straightforward to show the following approximation results of the interpolant r_h

$$\begin{aligned} \|u - r_h u\|_\Omega + h\|\nabla(u - r_h u)\|_h &\leq Ch^t |u|_{H^t(\Omega)} \\ \|h^{-\frac{1}{2}}(u - r_h u)\|_{\mathcal{F}} + \|h^{\frac{1}{2}}\nabla(u - r_h u) \cdot n_F\|_{\mathcal{F}} &\leq Ch^{t-1}|u|_{H^t(\Omega)} \end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

where $t \in \{1, 2\}$. It will also be useful to bound the L^2-norm of the interpolant r_h by its values on the element faces. To this end we prove a technical lemma.

Lemma 3.1. *For any function $v_h \in X_h$ there holds*

$$\|v_h\|_\Omega \leq c_{\mathcal{T}} \left(\sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}} h_F \|\overline{\{v_h\}}\|_F^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

Proof. It follows by norm equivalence of discrete spaces on the reference element and a scaling argument (under the assumption of shape regularity) that for all $\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h$

$$\|v_h\|_\kappa^2 \leq C \sum_{F \in \partial\kappa} h_F \|\overline{v}_h\|_F^2. \tag{3.15}$$

The claim follows by summing over the elements of $\mathcal{T}_h$ and recalling that $\|\overline{v}_h\|_F^2 = \|\overline{\{v_h\}}\|_F^2$. □

For the analysis below we also need a quasi-interpolation operator that maps piecewise linear, nonconforming functions into the space of piecewise linear conforming functions. Let $I_{\mathrm{cf}}[Q_h]^d \cup V_h \mapsto V \cap V_h$ denote the quasi interpolation of u_h into $V_h \cap V$, [17, 2, 18] such that

$$\|I_{\mathrm{cf}} u_h - u_h\|_\Omega + h\|\nabla(I_{\mathrm{cf}} u_h - u_h)\|_h \lesssim \|h^{\frac{1}{2}}[u_h]\|_{\mathcal{F}_i}$$

and for $v_h \in X_h$

$$\|I_{\mathrm{cf}} \nabla v_h - \nabla v_h\|_h \lesssim \|h^{\frac{1}{2}}[\nabla v_h]\|_{\mathcal{F}_i}. \tag{3.16}$$

Below, the global conservation properties of this operator will be important and we therefore propose the following perturbed variant that satisfies a global conservation property. We define the modified interpolant by

$$\tilde{u}_h := I_{\mathrm{cf}} u_h + d_h \tag{3.17}$$

where the perturbation $d_h \in V_h \cap V$ is the solution to the following constrained problem, $\bar{p} \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\begin{aligned} (d_h, w_h)_h + (\nabla d_h, \nabla w_h)_h + (\bar{p}, \nabla \cdot w_h)_h &= 0 \\ (\nabla \cdot d_h, \bar{q})_h &= (-\nabla \cdot I_{\mathrm{cf}} u_h, \bar{q})_h, \end{aligned} \tag{3.18}$$

for all $(w_h, \bar{q}) \in (V_h \cap V) \times \mathbb{R}$. This implies that

$$\int_{\partial\Omega} \tilde{u}_h \cdot n \, \mathrm{d}s = \int_\Omega \nabla \cdot \tilde{u}_h \, \mathrm{d}x = |\Omega| \overline{\nabla \cdot (I_{\mathrm{cf}} u_h + d_h)} = 0$$

with $|\Omega|$ denoting the d-measure of Ω and

$$\overline{\nabla \cdot I_{\mathrm{cf}} u_h} := |\Omega|^{-1} \int_\Omega \nabla \cdot I_{\mathrm{cf}} u_h \, \mathrm{d}x.$$

Lemma 3.2. *The problem* (3.18) *is well-posed and the solution satisfies*

$$\|d_h\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq \|\overline{\nabla \cdot I_{\mathrm{cf}} u_h}\|_\Omega \lesssim \|h^{-\frac{1}{2}}[u_h]\|_{\mathcal{F}_i} + \|\overline{\nabla \cdot u_h}\|_h$$

Proof. Since the linear system corresponding to (3.18) is square, existence and uniqueness is a consequence of the stability estimate. Take $w_h = d_h + \alpha \bar{p}\mathbf{x}$, with $\alpha > 0$, $\bar{q} = \bar{p}$ in (3.18) and observe that for α small enough, there exists $c(\alpha) > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}\|d_h\|^2_{H^1(\Omega)} + c(\alpha)\|\bar{p}\|^2_\Omega \lesssim \|\overline{\nabla \cdot I_{\mathrm{cf}} u_h}\|^2_\Omega \lesssim \|\overline{\nabla \cdot (I_{\mathrm{cf}} u_h - u_h)}\|^2_h + \|\overline{\nabla \cdot u_h}\|^2_h \\ \lesssim \|h^{-\frac{1}{2}}[u_h]\|^2_{\mathcal{F}_i} + \|\overline{\nabla \cdot u_h}\|^2_h. \quad (3.19)\end{aligned}$$

□

An immediate consequence of Lemma 3.2 is that $\tilde{u}_h$ satisfies similar approximation estimates as I_{cf}, but with improved global conservation. We collect these results, the proof of which is an immediate consequence of the discussion above, in a corollary.

Corollary 3.3. *The conforming approximation $\tilde{u}_h$ satisfies the discrete estimate,*

$$\|\tilde{u}_h - u_h\|_{1,h} \lesssim \|h^{-\frac{1}{2}}[u_h]\|_{\mathcal{F}_i} + \|\nabla \cdot u_h\|_h \quad (3.20)$$

and has the global conservation property

$$\int_{\partial\Omega} \tilde{u}_h \cdot n \, \mathrm{d}s = 0.$$

Using the regularity assumptions on the data in $l(w)$ it is straightforward to show that the formulation satisfies the following weak consistency

Lemma 3.4. *(Weak consistency) Let (u, p) be the solution of* (2.1)*, with $f \in L^2(\Omega)$, and let $(u_h, p_h) \in \mathcal{V}$ be the solution of* (3.6)*. Then, for all $w_h \in W_h$, there holds,*

$$\begin{aligned}|a_h(u_h - u, w_h) + b_h(p_h - p, w_h)| \\ \leq \inf_{(\nu_h, \eta_h) \in \mathcal{V}} \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}} \int_F |n_F \cdot (\sigma(u, p) - \{\sigma(\nu_h, \eta_h)\})||[w_h]| \, \mathrm{d}s. \quad (3.21)\end{aligned}$$

where $\sigma(u, p) := \nabla u - \mathcal{I}p$, with $\mathcal{I}$ the identity matrix.

Proof. Multiplying (2.1) with $w_h \in W_h$ and integrating by parts we have

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Omega f w_h \, \mathrm{d}x = -\int_\Omega \nabla \cdot (\nabla u - \mathcal{I}p) \cdot w_h \, \mathrm{d}x \\ = -\sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{F \in \partial\kappa} \int_F \sigma(u, p) \cdot n_\kappa \cdot w_h \, \mathrm{d}s + a_h(u, w_h) + b_h(p, w_h) \quad (3.22)\end{aligned}$$

or by rearranging terms

$$a_h(u, w_h) + b_h(p, w_h) = l(w_h) + \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{F \in \partial\kappa} \int_F \sigma(u, p) \cdot n_\kappa \cdot w_h \, \mathrm{d}s.$$

Using (3.6) we obtain

$$a_h(u_h - u, w_h) + b_h(p_h - p, w_h) = - \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{F \in \partial\kappa} \int_F \sigma(u, p) \cdot n_\kappa \cdot w_h \, \mathrm{d}s.$$

Since every internal face appears twice with different orientation of n_κ we have for all $\nu_h \in V_h$,

$$\sum_{F \in \partial\kappa} \int_F \sigma(u, p) \cdot n_\kappa \cdot w_h \, \mathrm{d}s = \sum_{F \in \partial\kappa} \int_F n_\kappa \cdot (\sigma(u, p) - \{\sigma(\nu_h, \eta_h)\}) \cdot w_h \, \mathrm{d}s.$$

We now observe that by replacing w_h with the jump $[w_h]$ we may write the sum over the faces of the mesh, replacing n_κ by n_F. The conclusion follows by taking absolute values on both sides and moving the absolute values under the integral sign resulting in the desired inequality. □

Lemma 3.5. *Let $U := (u, p) \in V \times Q^0$ denote the solution to (2.7)-(2.8) with $\delta u = 0$. Then there holds*

$$|\mathcal{A}[(U - U_h, Z_h), (X_h, Y_h)] - \mathcal{S}_h[(U_h, Z_h), (X_h, Y_h)] + m(\tilde{u}_{\mathcal{M}} - u_h, v_h)| \\ \leq \inf_{(\nu_h, \eta_h) \in \mathcal{V}} \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}} \int_F |n_F \cdot (\sigma(u, p) - \{\sigma(\nu_h, \eta_h)\})||[w_h]| \, ds$$

for all $(X_h, Y_h) := ([w, y_h], [v_h, q_h]) \in \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{W}$.

Proof. Subtract (3.6) from (2.7)-(2.8) and apply Lemma 3.4 to the equation for the primal variable U. □

Lemma 3.6. *For any $v \in [H^1(\Omega)]^d$, $y \in L^2(\Omega)$ and for all $w_h \in W_h$, $q_h \in Q_h$ there holds*

$$a_h(v - r_h v, w_h) = 0, \; b_h(q_h, v - r_h v) = 0 \text{ and } b_h(y - \pi_0 y, w_h) = 0$$

Proof. By integration by parts we have, using the orthogonality property on the faces of r_h,

$$a_h(v - r_h v, w_h) = \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{F \in \partial\kappa} \int_F (v - r_h v) \cdot (n_\kappa \cdot \nabla w_h) \, \mathrm{d}s = 0,$$

$$b_h(q_h, v - r_h v) = \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{F \in \partial\kappa} \int_F (v - r_h v) \cdot n_\kappa q_h \, \mathrm{d}s = 0,$$

and by definition

$$b_h(p - \pi_0 p, w_h) = (p - \pi_0 p, \nabla \cdot w_h)_h = 0.$$

□

Lemma 3.7. *Let $(u_h, p_h) \in \mathcal{V}$ then there holds*

$$\|h^{\frac{1}{2}} n_F \cdot [\nabla u_h]\|_{\mathcal{F}_i} + \|h^{\frac{1}{2}} [p_h]\|_{\mathcal{F}_i} \lesssim \|h^{\frac{1}{2}} n_F \cdot [\nabla u_h - \mathcal{I} p_h]\|_{\mathcal{F}_i} + \|\nabla \cdot u_h\|_\Omega + \|h^{-\frac{1}{2}} [u_h]\|_{\mathcal{F}_i}.$$

Proof. Let u_i, $i = 1, \ldots, d$ denote the components of u_h and define the tangential projection of the gradient matrix on the face F by $T \nabla u_h := (I - n_F \otimes n_F) \nabla u_h$ where $\otimes$ denotes outer product. Considering one face $F \in \mathcal{F}_i$ we have

$$\|h^{\frac{1}{2}} n_F \cdot [\nabla u_h - \mathcal{I} p_h]\|_F^2 = \|h^{\frac{1}{2}} n_F \cdot [\nabla u_h]\|_F^2 + \|h^{\frac{1}{2}} [p_h]\|_F^2 - 2 \int_F h_F n_F \cdot [\nabla u_h] \cdot (n_F \cdot [\mathcal{I} p_h]) \mathrm{d}s.$$

The integrand of the last term of the right hand side may be written

$$n_F \cdot [\nabla u_h] \cdot (n_F \cdot [\mathcal{I} p_h]) = [p_h] \sum_{i=1}^{d} \sum_{j=1}^{d} n_{F,i} n_{F,j} [\partial_{x_j} u_i].$$

By applying the following identity

$$\sum_{i=1}^{d} \sum_{j=1}^{d} n_{F,i} n_{F,j} \partial_{x_j} u_i = \nabla \cdot u_h - \operatorname{tr}(T \nabla u_h),$$

where $\operatorname{tr}(T\nabla u_h)$ denotes the trace of $T\nabla u_h$, we may write

$$[p_h] \left(\sum_{i=1}^{d} \sum_{j=1}^{d} n_{F,i} n_{F,j} [\partial_{x_j} u_i] \right) = [p_h] \left([\nabla \cdot u_h] - [\operatorname{tr}(T \nabla u_h)] \right).$$

Observe that since the tangential component of the gradient of the conforming approximation $I_{\mathrm{cf}} u_h$ does not jump we have

$$[\operatorname{tr}(T \nabla u_h)] = [\operatorname{tr}(T(\nabla u_h - \nabla I_{\mathrm{cf}} u_h)].$$

Collecting these identities we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_F h_F n_F \cdot [\nabla u_h] \cdot n_F \cdot [\mathcal{I} p_h] \mathrm{d}s &= \int_F h_F [p_h] \Big([\nabla \cdot u_h] - [\operatorname{tr}(T \nabla (u_h - I_{\mathrm{cf}} u_h))] \Big) \mathrm{d}s \\ &\leq \|h^{\frac{1}{2}} [p_h]\|_F C_i (\|\nabla (u_h - I_{\mathrm{cf}} u_h)\|_{\Delta_F} + \|\nabla \cdot u_h\|_{\Delta_F}), \end{aligned}$$

where Δ_F denotes the union of the elements that have F as common face. Consequently

$$2 \int_F h_F n_F \cdot [\nabla u_h] \cdot n_F \cdot [\mathcal{I} p_h] \mathrm{d}s \leq \frac{1}{2} \|h^{\frac{1}{2}} [p_h]\|_F^2 + C \|h^{-\frac{1}{2}} [u_h]\|_{\mathcal{F}_{\Delta_F}}^2 + C \|\nabla \cdot u_h\|_{\Delta_F}^2.$$

Summing over $F \in \mathcal{F}_i$ we see that

$$\|h^{\frac{1}{2}} n_F \cdot [\nabla u_h]\|_{\mathcal{F}_i}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|h^{\frac{1}{2}} [p_h]\|_{\mathcal{F}_i}^2 \lesssim \|h^{\frac{1}{2}} n_F \cdot [\nabla u_h - \mathcal{I} p_h]\|_{\mathcal{F}_i}^2 + \|\nabla \cdot u_h\|_\Omega^2 + C \|h^{-\frac{1}{2}} [u_h]\|_{\mathcal{F}_i}^2$$

which proves the claim. □

Lemma 3.8. *(Discrete Poincaré inequality) For all $(u_h, p_h) \in V_h \times Q_h^0$ there holds*

$$\|h u_h\|_{1,h} \lesssim \|h^{\frac{1}{2}} n_F \cdot [\nabla u_h]\|_{\mathcal{F}_i} + \|h^{-\frac{1}{2}} [u_h]\|_{\mathcal{F}_i} + \|u_h\|_\omega$$

and

$$\|h p_h\|_\Omega \lesssim \|h^{\frac{1}{2}} [p_h]\|_{\mathcal{F}_i}.$$

Proof. For the first inequality use the Poincaré inequality for nonconforming finite elements and a triangle inequality

$$\|h u_h\|_{1,h} \lesssim \|h(\nabla u_h - I_{\mathrm{cf}} \nabla u_h)\|_h + \|h I_{\mathrm{cf}} \nabla u_h\|_h.$$

Then observe that for $I_{\mathrm{cf}} \nabla u_h$ constant, $\|u_h\|_\omega = 0$ implies that $I_{\mathrm{cf}} \nabla u_h = 0$ and therefore [12, Lemma B.63]

$$\|h I_{\mathrm{cf}} \nabla u_h\|_h \leq \|h \nabla (I_{\mathrm{cf}} \nabla u_h - \nabla u_h)\|_h + \|u_h\|_\omega.$$

Using (3.16) componentwise twice we then have

$$\|h u_h\|_{1,h} \lesssim \|h^{\frac{1}{2}} [\nabla u_h]\|_{\mathcal{F}_i} + \|u_h\|_\omega.$$

Finally each component of ∇u_h is decomposed on the normal and tangential component on each face F and we observe that using an elementwise trace inequality,

$$\|h^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathcal{I} - n_F \otimes n_F)[\nabla u_h]\|_{\mathcal{F}_i} = \|h^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathcal{I} - n_F \otimes n_F)[\nabla(u_h - I_{\mathrm{cf}} u_h)]\|_{\mathcal{F}_i} \\ \lesssim \|\nabla(u_h - I_{\mathrm{cf}} u_h)\|_h \lesssim \|h^{-\frac{1}{2}}[u_h]\|_{\mathcal{F}_i}.$$

Similarly for the proof of the second inequality observe that since (redefining I_{cf} to act on a scalar variable, and once again by [12, Lemma B.63]) $\|hI_{\mathrm{cf}} p_h\|_\Omega \lesssim \|h\nabla I_{\mathrm{cf}} p_h\|_\Omega + \int_\Omega hI_{\mathrm{cf}} p_h \,\mathrm{d}x$ there holds

$$\|hp_h\|_h \lesssim \|h(p_h - I_{\mathrm{cf}} p_h)\|_h + \|h\nabla(I_{\mathrm{cf}} p_h - p_h)\|_h + \int_\Omega h(I_{\mathrm{cf}} p_h - p_h) \,\mathrm{d}x.$$

It then follows using an inverse inequality that

$$\|hp_h\|_h \lesssim \|p_h - I_{\mathrm{cf}} p_h\|_\Omega \lesssim \|h^{\frac{1}{2}}[p_h]\|_{\mathcal{F}_i}$$

and the proof is complete. □

4 Stability estimates

We will now focus on the formulation (3.6) with $\gamma_p = \gamma_x = 0$. An immediate consequence of this choice is that any solution to the system must satisfy

$$\nabla \cdot u_h|_\kappa = \nabla \cdot z_h|_\kappa = 0, \ \forall \kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h. \tag{4.1}$$

The issue of stability of the discrete formulation is crucial since we have no coercivity or inf–sup stability of the continuous formulation (2.7)–(2.8) to rely on. Indeed here the regularization plays an important part, since it defines a semi-norm on the discrete space. We introduce a mesh-dependent norm for the primal variable $X_h := (v_h, q_h) \in \mathcal{V}$

$$|||X_h|||_{V,Q} := \|h^{\frac{1}{2}} n_F \cdot [\nabla v_h]\|_{\mathcal{F}_i} + \|h^{\frac{1}{2}}[q_h]\|_{\mathcal{F}_i} + \gamma_M^{\frac{1}{2}} \|v_h\|_\omega + \|h^{-\frac{1}{2}}[v_h]\|_{\mathcal{F}_i}, \tag{4.2}$$

We will also use the following triple norm with control of both the dual pressure variabel x_h and the dual velocities z_h.

$$|||(U_h, Z_h)||| := |||U_h|||_{V,Q} + \|x_h\|_\Omega + \|\nabla z_h\|_h.$$

Since Dirichlet boundary conditions are set weakly on W_h, $|||(U_h, Z_h)|||$ can be shown to be a norm on $V_h \times Q_h^0$ using Lemmata 3.7–3.8. We now prove a fundamental stability result for the discretization (3.6).

Theorem 4.1. *Let $\gamma_u, \gamma_M > 0$, $\gamma_p = \gamma_x = 0$ in (3.6)–(3.8). There exists a positive constant c_s, that is independent of h, but not of γ_u, γ_M or the local mesh geometry, such that for all $(U_h, Z_h) \in \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{W}$ there holds*

$$c_s |||(U_h, Z_h)||| \leq \sup_{(X_h, Y_h) \in \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{W}} \frac{\mathcal{G}[(U_h, Z_h), (X_h, Y_h)]}{|||(X_h, Y_h)|||}$$

Proof. First we observe that by testing with $X_h = U_h$ and $Y_h = -Z_h$ we have

$$\gamma_u \|h^{-\frac{1}{2}}[u_h]\|_{\mathcal{F}_i}^2 + \gamma_M \|u_h\|_\omega^2 = \mathcal{G}[(U_h, Z_h), (U_h, -Z_h)].$$

Then observe that by integrating by parts in the bilinear form $a_h(\cdot,\cdot)$ and using the zero mean value property of the approximation space we have

$$a_h(u_h, w_h) + b_h(p_h, w_h) = \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}_i} \int_F [n_F \cdot \nabla u_h - p_h n_F] \cdot \{w_h\} \,\mathrm{d}s.$$

Define the function $\xi_h \in W_h$ such that for every face $F \in \mathcal{F}_i$

$$\overline{\{\xi_h\}}|_F := h_F[n_F \cdot \nabla u_h - p_h n_F]|_F.$$

This is possible in the nonconforming finite element space since the degrees of freedom may be identified with the average value of the finite element function on an element face. Using Lemma 3.1 we have

$$\|\xi_h\|_\Omega^2 \leq c_{\mathcal{T}} \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}_i} h_F^2 \|h_F^{\frac{1}{2}}[n_F \cdot \nabla u_h - p_h n_F]\|_F^2. \tag{4.3}$$

Testing with $Y_h = (\xi_h, 0)$ and $X_h = (0,0)$ we get

$$\|h^{\frac{1}{2}}[n_F \cdot \nabla u_h - p_h n_F]\|_{\mathcal{F}_i}^2 = \mathcal{G}[(U_h, Z_h), (0, Y_h)].$$

By testing with $X_h = (z_h + \alpha r_h v_x, x_h)$, where $\alpha > 0$ and $v_x \in [H^1(\Omega)]^d$ is a function such that $\nabla \cdot v_x = x_h$ and $\|v_x\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq c_x \|x_h\|_\Omega$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla z_h\|_h^2 + \alpha\|x_h\|^2 + a_h(z_h, \alpha r_h v_x) \\ + \gamma_u s_{j,-1}(u_h, z_h + \alpha r_h v_x) + m(u_h, z_h + \alpha r_h v_x)_\omega \\ = \mathcal{G}[(U_h, Z_h), (X_h, 0)].\end{aligned}$$

Observe now that by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, the arithmetic-geometric inequality and the stability of $r_h v_x$ there holds

$$a_h(z_h, \alpha r_h v_x) \leq \frac{1}{4}\|\nabla z_h\|_h^2 + c_x^2 \alpha^2 \|x_h\|_\Omega^2.$$

Then by the trace inequality and Poincaré's inequality

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_u s_{j,-1}(u_h, z_h + \alpha r_h v_x) + \gamma_M (u_h, z_h + \alpha r_h v_x)_\omega \\ \lesssim (\gamma_u \|h^{-\frac{1}{2}}[u_h]\|_{\mathcal{F}_i} + \gamma_M \|u_h\|_\omega)(\|\nabla z_h\|_h + \|v_x\|_{H^1(\Omega)}) \\ \leq C_\gamma(\gamma_u \|h^{-\frac{1}{2}}[u_h]\|_{\mathcal{F}_i}^2 + \gamma_M \|u_h\|_\omega^2) + \frac{1}{4}(\|\nabla z_h\|_h^2 + \alpha^2 \|x_h\|_\Omega^2).\end{aligned}$$

The consequence of this is that for $\alpha, \beta > 0$ sufficiently small there exists c such that

$$\begin{aligned}c\Big(\|h^{-\frac{1}{2}}[u_h]\|_{\mathcal{F}_i}^2 + \|\nabla z_h\|_h^2 + \|u_h\|_\omega^2 \\ + \|x_h\|_\Omega^2 + \|h^{\frac{1}{2}}[n_F \cdot \nabla x_h - p_h n_F]\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2\Big) \\ \leq \mathcal{G}[(U_h, Z_h), (X_{UZ}, Y_{UZ})],\end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

where $X_{UZ} = U_h + (\beta(z_h + \alpha r_h v_x), x_h)$, $Y_{UZ} = -Z_h + (\xi_h, 0)$. Applying Lemma 3.7, recalling that $\|\nabla \cdot u_h\|_h = 0$ we deduce that

$$C|||(U_h, Z_h)|||^2 \leq \mathcal{G}[(U_h, Z_h), (X_{UZ}, Y_{UZ})]. \tag{4.5}$$

It remains to prove that $|||(X_{UZ}, Y_{UZ})||| \lesssim |||(U_h, Z_h)|||$. This follows by observing that

$$\begin{aligned}|||(X_{UZ}, Y_{UZ})||| \leq |||(U_h, Z_h)||| \\ + \beta(\|h^{\frac{1}{2}}[\nabla(z_h + \alpha r_h v_x)]\|_{\mathcal{F}_i} + \|(z_h + \alpha r_h v_x)\|_\omega + \|h^{-\frac{1}{2}}[z_h + \alpha r_h v_x]\|_{\mathcal{F}_i}) + \|\nabla \xi_h\|_h\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\|h^{\frac{1}{2}}[\nabla(z_h + \alpha r_h v_x)]\|_{\mathcal{F}_i} + \|(z_h + \alpha r_h v_x)\|_\omega + \|h^{-\frac{1}{2}}[z_h + \alpha r_h v_x]\|_{\mathcal{F}_i} \lesssim \|z_h\|_{1,h} + \|r_h v_x\|_{1,h} \\ \lesssim \|\nabla z_h\|_h + \|x_h\|_\Omega.\end{aligned}$$

Finally we use an inverse inequality and the bound (4.3) to obtain the bound

$$\|\nabla \xi_h\|_h \lesssim \|h_F^{\frac{1}{2}}[n_F \cdot \nabla u_h - p_h n_F]\|_{\mathcal{F}_i} \lesssim |||(U_h, 0)|||$$

which finishes the proof. □

Corollary 4.2. *The formulation* (3.6) *admits a unique solution* $(u_h, p_h) \in \mathcal{V}$ *and* $(z_h, x_h) \in \mathcal{W}$.

Proof. The system matrix corresponding to (3.6) is a square matrix and we only need to show that there are no zero eigenvalues. Assume that $l(w_h) = 0$. It then follows by Theorem 4.1 that for any solution (u_h, p_h) there holds

$$c_s|||(U_h, Z_h)||| \leq \sup_{(X_h,Y_h)\in\mathcal{V}\times\mathcal{W}} \frac{\mathcal{G}[(U_h, Z_h), (X_h, Y_h)]}{|||(X_h, Y_h)|||} = 0.$$

Recalling Lemma 3.8 this implies that $u_h = p_h = z_h = x_h = 0$ showing that the solution is unique. □

Remark 4.3. *Observe that the proof of Theorem 4.1 works also for* $\gamma_p > 0$ *and* $\gamma_x > 0$*, the only modification in this case is that the contribution* $\|\nabla \cdot u_h\|_h$ *must be added to the norm* $|||(u_h, p_h)|||_V$ *and stability must be proven by testing with* $y_h = \nabla \cdot u_h$.

5 Error estimates using conditional stability

In this section we will use the stability proven in the previous section to derive error estimates.

Proposition 5.1. *Let* $(u, p) \in [H^2(\Omega)]^d \times H^1(\Omega)$ *be the solution of* (2.1) *and* $(u_h, p_h) \times Z_h$ *the solution to* (3.6)–(3.8)*, with* $\gamma_u, \gamma_M > 0$ *and* $\gamma_p = \gamma_x = 0$*. Then there holds*

$$|||((r_h u - u_h, \pi_0 p - p_h), Z_h)||| \lesssim h(\|u\|_{H^2(\Omega)} + \|p\|_{H^1(\Omega)}) + \gamma_M^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\delta u\|_\omega$$

Proof. First denote the discrete error $\Theta_h = (r_h u - u_h, \pi_0 p - p_h)$. Then by Theorem 4.1

$$c_s|||(\Theta_h, Z_h)|||^2 \leq \sup_{(X_h,Y_h)\in\mathcal{V}\times\mathcal{W}} \frac{\mathcal{G}[(\Theta_h, Z_h), (X_h, Y_h)]}{|||(X_h, Y_h)|||}.$$

Then applying Lemma 3.5 and 3.6 we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{G}[(\Theta_h, Z_h), (X_h, Y_h)] \leq \inf_{(\nu_h,\eta_h)\in V_h\times W_h} \sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}} \int_F |(\sigma(u, p) - \{\sigma(\nu_h, \eta_h)\}) \cdot n_F||[w_h]| \, \mathrm{d}s \\ - b_h(y_h, r_h u - u) + s_{j,-1}(r_h u, v_h) + \gamma_M (r_h u - u - \delta u, v_h)_\omega.\end{aligned}$$

First note that

$$\begin{aligned}\inf_{(\nu_h,\eta_h)\in\mathcal{V}} \sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}} \int_F |(\sigma(u, p) - \{\sigma(\nu_h, \eta_h)\}) \cdot n_F||[w_h]| \, \mathrm{d}s \\ \leq h^{\frac{1}{2}} \Big(\inf_{(\nu_h,\eta_h)\in\mathcal{V}} \sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}} \|\sigma(u, p) - \{\sigma(\nu_h, \eta_h)\}\|_F^2 \Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla w_h\|_h \\ \lesssim h(\|u\|_{H^2(\Omega)} + \|p\|_{H^1(\Omega)})|||(0, Y_h)|||,\end{aligned}$$

$$b_h(y_h, r_h u - u) = 0,$$

$$s_{j,-1}(r_h u, v_h) \leq Ch\|u\|_{H^2(\Omega)} \|h^{-\frac{1}{2}}[v_h]\|_{\mathcal{F}_i} \leq Ch\|u\|_{H^2(\Omega)}|||(X_h, 0)|||.$$

Finally, using a Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and a Poincaré inequality for η_h

$$\gamma_M (r_h u - u, v_h)_\omega \lesssim \gamma_M \|r_h u - u\|_\omega \|v_h\|_\omega \lesssim h^2 \|u\|_{H^2(\Omega)}|||(X_h, 0)|||.$$

For the perturbation we have

$$\gamma_M (\delta u, w_h)_\omega \leq \gamma_M \|\delta u\|_\omega \|w_h\|_\omega.$$

Collecting the above estimates ends the proof. □

Theorem 5.2. *Assume that $u \in [H^2(\Omega)]^d$ and $p \in H^1(\Omega)$. Let $\tilde{u}_h$ be defined by (3.17) then*

$$\|\tilde{u}_h\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + \|p_h\|_\Omega \lesssim \|u\|_{H^2(\Omega)} + \|p\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + \gamma_M^{\frac{1}{2}} h^{-1} \|\delta u\|_\omega$$

and, if $\delta u = 0$

$$\tilde{u}_h \rightharpoonup u \text{ in } [H^1(\Omega)]^d \text{ and } p_h \rightharpoonup p \text{ in } L^2\Omega).$$

Proof. For the pressure we immediately observe that

$$\|p_h\|_\Omega \lesssim \|p_h - \pi_0 p\|_\Omega + \|p\|_\Omega \lesssim h^{-1} |||(0, p_h - \pi_0 p)|||_V + \|p\|_\Omega$$

Then observe that by a Poincaré inequality and the H^1-stability of the interpolation operator r_h there holds

$$\begin{aligned}\|\tilde{u}_h\|_{H^1(\Omega)} &\leq \|\tilde{u}_h - u_h\|_{1,h} + \|u_h\|_{1,h} \\ &\leq \|\tilde{u}_h - u_h\|_{1,h} + \|u_h - r_h u\|_{1,h} + \|r_h u\|_{1,h} \\ &\lesssim \|h^{-\frac{1}{2}}[u_h - r_h u]\|_{\mathcal{F}_i} + \|u_h - r_h u\|_\omega + \|\nabla(u_h - r_h u)\|_h + \|u\|_{H^1(\Omega)}.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\|\tilde{u}_h\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \lesssim h^{-1} |||(u_h - r_h u, 0)|||_V + \|u\|_{H^1(\Omega)}$$

and the first claim follows by applying Proposition 5.1.

It follows that for $\delta u = 0$ we may extract a subsequence of pairs $(\tilde{u}_h, p_h)$ that converges weakly in $[H^1(\Omega)]^d \times L^2(\Omega)$. By construction the divergence of the H^1-conforming part satisfies

$$\|\nabla \cdot \tilde{u}_h\|_\Omega \lesssim \|h^{-\frac{1}{2}}[u_h - r_h u]\|_{\mathcal{F}_i} + \underbrace{\|\nabla \cdot u_h\|_h}_{=0} + h\|u\|_{H^2(\Omega)} \lesssim h\|u\|_{H^2(\Omega)}$$

and hence $\|\nabla \cdot \tilde{u}\|_h \to 0$ for $h \to 0$. It remains to show that the weak limit is a weak solution of Stokes equation. To this end consider, with $w \in C_0^1(\Omega)$,

$$\begin{aligned}&|a(\tilde{u}_h, w) + b(p_h, w) - l(w)| \\ &\quad = |a_h(\tilde{u}_h - u_h, w) + a_h(u_h, w - r_h w) + b(p_h, w - r_h w) - l(w - r_h w)| \\ &\quad = |a_h(\tilde{u}_h - u_h, w) - l(w - r_h w)| \lesssim (\|h^{-\frac{1}{2}}[u_h]\|_{\mathcal{F}_i} + h\|f\|_\Omega)\|w\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \\ &\quad \lesssim h\|w\|_{H^1(\Omega)}\end{aligned}$$

We conclude by taking the limit $h \to 0$.

□

Theorem 5.3. *Assume that $(u, p) \in [H^2(\Omega)]^d \times H^1(\Omega)$ is the unique solution of (2.1) with $u = u_M$ in ω and the parameters R_1, R_2 and R_3 satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 2.1. If u_h is the solution of (3.6)-(3.8), with $\gamma_u, \gamma_M > 0$, $\gamma_p = \gamma_x = 0$ and $\|\delta u\|_\Omega \leq h_0$, $h_0 > 0$, then, for $h > h_0$, there holds*

$$\|u - u_h\|_{B_{R_2}(x_0)} \lesssim h^\tau$$

where τ is the power from Theorem 2.1 and the hidden constant depends on R_2/R_3, the local mesh geometry and $\|u\|_{H^2(\Omega)}$ and $\|p\|_{H^1(\Omega)}$.

Proof. First let $u - u_h = \underbrace{u - \tilde{u}_h}_{e_u \in [H^1(\Omega)]^d} + \underbrace{\tilde{u}_h - u_h}_{e_h \in V_h}$, where $\tilde{u}_h$ is defined by (3.17). We recall that

$$\|e_h\|_\Omega \lesssim \|h^{-\frac{1}{2}}[u_h]\|_{\mathcal{F}_i} \leq Ch\|u\|_{H^2(\Omega)}$$

so we only need to bound $\|e_u\|_{B_{R_2}(x_0)}$. Also introduce $e_p = p - p_h \in L^2(\Omega)$. It follows that (e_u, e_p) is a solution to the Stokes' equation on weak form with a particular right hand side. Indeed we have for all $(w, q) \in [H_0^1(\Omega)]^d \times Q$

$$a(e_u, w) + b(e_p, w) = l(w) - a(\tilde{u}_h, w) + b(p_h, w) =: \langle \mathfrak{f}, w \rangle_{V',V} \tag{5.1}$$

and

$$-b(q,e_u) = b(q,\tilde{u}_h) =: (\mathfrak{g},q)_\Omega \tag{5.2}$$

where $\mathfrak{f} \in V'$ and $\mathfrak{g} \in L^2_0(\Omega)$. Now consider the problem (2.1) with homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions on $\partial\Omega$ and the right hand side $\mathfrak{f}$ and $\mathfrak{g}$ as defined above. This problem is well-posed and we call its solution $\{\mathcal{E}_u, \mathcal{E}_p\} \in [H^1_0(\Omega)]^d \times L^2_0(\Omega)$. By the well-posedness of the problem we know that

$$\|\mathcal{E}_u\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + \|\mathcal{E}_p\|_\Omega \leq \|\mathfrak{f}\|_{H^{-1}(\Omega)} + \|\mathfrak{g}\|_\Omega$$

We know from equation (3.20), the fact that $\|\nabla \cdot u_h\|_h = 0$ and Proposition 5.1 that $\|\mathfrak{g}\|_\Omega \lesssim \|h^{-\frac{1}{2}}[u_h]\|_{\mathcal{F}_i} \lesssim h$ and for $\|\mathfrak{f}\|_{V'}$ we derive the bound

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{\substack{w\in[H^1_0]^d \\ \|w\|_1=1}} \langle \mathfrak{f}, w\rangle_{V'V} &= l(w) - a(\tilde{u}_h, w) - b(p_h, w) \\ &= l(w - r_h w) - a_h(\tilde{u}_h - u_h, w) \\ &\lesssim h\|f\|_\Omega + s_{j,-1}(u_h,u_h)^{\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim h + \|\delta u\|_\omega. \end{aligned} \tag{5.3}$$

Considering now the functions $U := u - \tilde{u}_h - \mathcal{E}_u$ and $P := p - p_h - \mathcal{E}_p$ we see that $\{U, P\}$ is a solution to (2.1) with $\mathfrak{f} = 0$ and $\mathfrak{g} = 0$. By equation (2.3) we have $\{U, P\} \in [H^2(\varpi)]^d \times H^1(\varpi)$ on every compact $\varpi \subset \Omega$. We may then apply Theorem 2.1 to U and obtain

$$\int_{B_{R_2}(x_0)} |U|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x \leq C \left(\int_{B_{R_1}(x_0)} |U|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x\right)^{\tau} \left(\int_{B_{R_3}(x_0)} |U|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x\right)^{1-\tau}. \tag{5.4}$$

These results may now be combined in the following way to prove the theorem. First by the triangle inequality, writing $u - u_h = U + \mathcal{E}_u + \tilde{u}_h - u_h$,

$$\|u - u_h\|_{B_{R_2}(x_0)} \leq \|\mathcal{E}_u\|_{B_{R_2}(x_0)} + \|\tilde{u}_h - u_h\|_{B_{R_2}(x_0)} + \|U\|_{B_{R_2}(x_0)} = I + II + III.$$

By (2.2) and (5.3) there holds for the first term

$$I \lesssim \|\mathcal{E}_u\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \lesssim h + \|\delta u\|_\omega$$

and using the discrete interpolation and Proposition 5.1

$$II = \|\tilde{u}_h - u_h\|_{B_{R_2}(x_0)} \lesssim \|h^{-\frac{1}{2}}[u_h]\|_{\mathcal{F}_i} \lesssim h + \|\delta u\|_\omega.$$

For the last term, using (5.4), we have

$$III \lesssim \left(\int_{B_{R_1}(x_0)} |U|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x\right)^{\tau/2} \left(\int_{B_{R_3}(x_0)} |U|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x\right)^{(1-\tau)/2}.$$

By the definition of U and since by assumption $B_{R_1}(x_0) \subset \omega$

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\int_{B_{R_1}(x_0)} |U|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} &\lesssim \|r_h u - u_h\|_\omega + \|r_h u - u\|_\omega + \|\tilde{u}_h - u_h\|_\omega \\ &\quad + \|\mathcal{E}_u\|_{B_{R_1}(x_0)} \lesssim h + \|\delta u\|_\omega. \end{aligned} \tag{5.5}$$

Here we applied Proposition 5.1, (3.14), discrete interpolation (3.20), and (2.2) applied to $\mathcal{E}_u$. Finally by the triangle inequality, the a priori assumption $u \in H^2(\Omega)$, (2.2) and the first claim of Theorem 5.2 we have

$$\left(\int_{B_{R_3}(x_0)} |U|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \|u\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + \|\tilde{u}_h\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + \|\mathcal{E}_u\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \lesssim 1 + h^{-1}\|\delta u\|_\omega.$$

The claim follows by collecting the bounds on the terms $I - III$ and applying the assumption on the perturbations in data versus the mesh-size. □

Remark 5.4. *It is straightforward to prove the Proposition 5.1 and the Theorems 5.2 and 5.3 also for $\gamma_p \geq 0$ and $\gamma_x \geq 0$ and thereby extending the analysis to include the method* (3.12)*. We leave the details for the reader.*

Remark 5.5. *One may also introduce perturbations in the right hand side f. Provided these perturbations are in $[L^2(\Omega)]^d$ the same results holds. Details on the necessary modifications can be found in [7].*

6 Numerical example

Our numerical example is set in the unit square $\Omega = (0,1)^2$ with zero right hand side and data given in the disc $S_{1/2} := \{(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \sqrt{(x-0.5)^2 + (y-0.5)^2} < 0.125\}$. The flow is nonsymmetric with the exact solution given by

$$u(x,y) = (20xy^3, 5x^4 - 5y^4) \qquad \text{and} \qquad p(x,y) = 60x^2y - 20y^3 - 5.$$

We consider the formulation (3.6)-(3.8), with $l(w_h) = 0$ For the parameters we chose, $\gamma_M = 800$ and $\gamma_u = 10^{-5}$, $\gamma_p = \gamma_z = \gamma_x = 0$. First we perform the computation with unperturbed data. The results are presented in the left graphic of Figure 1. We report the velocity error both in the global L^2-norm (open square markers), the local L^2-norm in the subdomain where $\sqrt{(x-0.5)^2 + (y-0.5)^2} < 0.375$ (filled square markers) and in the residual quantities of (6.1) (circle markers, r_1 filled, r_2 open),

$$r_1 := \left(\int_{S_{1/2}} (u_h - u)^2 \, \mathrm{d}x \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \text{ and } r_2 := \|h^{-\frac{1}{2}}[u_h]\|_{\mathcal{F}_i}. \tag{6.1}$$

The global pressure is plotted with triangle markers. The error plots for this case are given in figure 1. We observe the $O(h)$ convergence of the residual quantities (6.1). The global velocity and pressure L^2-errors appears to have approximately $O(|log(h)|^{-1})$ convergence. The local error matches the result of Theorem 5.3. Indeed the dotted line is shows the behavior of the quantity $C_1\|e\|_\Omega^{0.3}(r_1+r_2)^{0.7} + 10h^2$ illustrating the different components of the local error used in the proof of the theorem. We see that this quantity (with a properly chosen constant) gives a good fit with the local error.

The same computation was repeated with a 1% relative random perturbation of data. The results for this case is reported in the right plot of Figure 1. As predicted by theory the results are stable under perturbation of data as long as the discretization error is larger than the random perturbation (up to a constant). When the perturbations dominate the errors in all quantities appear to stagnate.



Figure 1: Relative L^2-error against mesh-size, left unperturbed data, right with 1% relative noise. Reference lines are the same in both plots and of orders, dashed lines $\approx O(h)$ with different constants, dash dot $\approx O(h^{\frac{3}{4}})$ and dotted $C_1\|e\|_\Omega^{0.3}(r_1+r_2)^{0.7}+10h^2$

References

[1] B. A. Abda, I. B. Saad, and M. Hassine. Data completion for the Stokes system. *Comptes Rendus Mecanique*, 337(9–10):703–708, 2009.

[2] Y. Achdou, C. Bernardi, and F. Coquel. A priori and a posteriori analysis of finite volume discretizations of Darcy's equations. *Numer. Math.*, 96(1):17–42, 2003.

[3] G. Alessandrini, L. Rondi, E. Rosset, and S. Vessella. The stability for the Cauchy problem for elliptic equations. *Inverse Problems*, 25(12):123004, 47, 2009.

[4] D. Boffi, F. Brezzi, and M. Fortin. *Mixed finite element methods and applications*, volume 44 of *Springer Series in Computational Mathematics*. Springer, Heidelberg, 2013.

[5] M. Boulakia, A.-C. Egloffe, and C. Grandmont. Stability estimates for the unique continuation property of the Stokes system and for an inverse boundary coefficient problem. *Inverse Problems*, 29(11):115001, 21, 2013.

[6] L. Bourgeois and J. Dardé. The "exterior approach" to solve the inverse obstacle problem for the Stokes system. *Inverse Probl. Imaging*, 8(1):23–51, 2014.

[7] E. Burman. A stabilized nonconforming finite element method for the elliptic Cauchy problem. *Math. Comp. (2017, to appear)*.

[8] E. Burman. Stabilized finite element methods for nonsymmetric, noncoercive, and ill-posed problems. Part I: Elliptic equations. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 35(6):A2752–A2780, 2013.

[9] E. Burman. Error estimates for stabilized finite element methods applied to ill-posed problems. *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 352(7-8):655–659, 2014.

[10] E. Burman and P. Hansbo. Stabilized Crouzeix-Raviart element for the Darcy-Stokes problem. *Numer. Methods Partial Differential Equations*, 21(5):986–997, 2005.

[11] M. Crouzeix and P.-A. Raviart. Conforming and nonconforming finite element methods for solving the stationary Stokes equations. I. *Rev. Française Automat. Informat. Recherche Opérationnelle Sér. Rouge*, 7(R-3):33–75, 1973.

[12] A. Ern and J.-L. Guermond. *Theory and practice of finite elements*, volume 159 of *Applied Mathematical Sciences*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2004.

[13] C. Fabre and G. Lebeau. Prolongement unique des solutions de l'equation de Stokes. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 21(3-4):573–596, 1996.

[14] V. Girault and P.-A. Raviart. *Finite element methods for Navier-Stokes equations*, volume 5 of *Springer Series in Computational Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1986.

[15] P. Hansbo and M. G. Larson. Discontinuous Galerkin methods for incompressible and nearly incompressible elasticity by Nitsche's method. *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg.*, 191(17-18):1895–1908, 2002.

[16] P. Hansbo and M. G. Larson. Discontinuous Galerkin and the Crouzeix-Raviart element: application to elasticity. *ESAIM: Math. Model. Numer. Anal.*, 37(1):63–72, 2003.

[17] R. H. W. Hoppe and B. Wohlmuth. Element-oriented and edge-oriented local error estimators for nonconforming finite element methods. *RAIRO Modél. Math. Anal. Numér.*, 30(2):237–263, 1996.

[18] O. A. Karakashian and F. Pascal. A posteriori error estimates for a discontinuous Galerkin approximation of second-order elliptic problems. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 41(6):2374–2399, 2003.

[19] C.-L. Lin, G. Uhlmann, and J.-N. Wang. Optimal three-ball inequalities and quantitative uniqueness for the Stokes system. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 28(3):1273–1290, 2010.

[20] G. Seregin. *Lecture notes on regularity theory for the Navier-Stokes equations*. World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte. Ltd., Hackensack, NJ, 2015.

[21] C. Wang and J. Wang. A Primal-Dual Weak Galerkin Finite Element Method for Second Order Elliptic Equations in Non-Divergence Form. *ArXiv e-prints*, October 2015.